

REMARKS

In the November 29, 2005 Restriction Requirement, four inventions (groups) were identified. As indicated in the first paragraph of this Response, Applicants elect claims in Group I for examination. In item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 29-31 were identified as a distinct invention identified as Group II "drawn to an IC card, comprising a central processing unit". Claim 29 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and thus, it is submitted that claims 29 and 31 which depends from claim 29 should be examined along with the elected claims.

With respect to claim 31, it is submitted that it was improperly included in Group II since it depended from claim 1, not claim 29. In addition, claim 31 has been amended to depend from claim 2. As a result, it is submitted that claim 31 not only is in the elected group, but also is within the elected species and should be examined along with the elected claims.

Claims 32, 33 and 37 were identified as Group III "drawn to a recording device in which is recorded a program for causing a CPU to execute a process protection program". The preambles of claims 32, 33 and 37 have been amended to include limitations similar to what is recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 32, 33 and 37 should be examined along with the elected claims.

Finally, claim 35 which was identified as a distinct invention in Group IV "drawn to a program-generating device generating a program executed by a computer" has been amended to include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. As a result, it is submitted that claim 35 should be examined along with the elected claims.

In item 9 on pages 3-5, fifteen (15) species were identified. As indicated in the first paragraph of this Response, Applicants elect species IA which was described as "drawn to a central processing unit comprising an encrypting unit, where the encrypting unit decrypts the encrypted block in units of cache." Claims 3, 7, 13, 14, and 18-26 have been amended to depend from claim 2. Thus, these claims and claims 4-6, 8-12 and 15-17 which depend therefrom now all include the limitation that "said encrypting unit decrypts the encrypted block in units of cache" (claim 2, line 3). Therefore, it is submitted that claims 3-26 should be examined along with the elected claims.

In the November 29, 2005 Restriction Requirement, claim 28 was identified as included in Group I, but no indication was provided of the species to which it had been assigned. Since claim 28 recites "an encrypting unit encrypting a block, and decrypting an encrypted block"

Serial No. 10/614,921

(claim 28, lines 2-3), it is submitted that claim 28 should have been included in species IA and should be examined along with the elected claims.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/29/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 12/29, 2005
By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Date: December 29, 2005